

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-34 were pending at the time of examination. Claims 1, 13, and 14 have been amended. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner referred to the term “logical routing” as being unclear. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described in the present application beginning at paragraph [1087], “[w]ith logical routing, a service can modify the routing of the message or modify the context of the message for delivery to the next service. Significantly, a service can be logically included in a message routing, without being included as part of the physical routing of the message.” Specific examples of implementations of logical routing as enabled by routing scripts are described in the present specification in paragraphs [1088]-[1095]. According to such implementations, “logical routing is represented by the sequential evaluation of the routing scripts that are defined by those services.” See paragraph [1089].

Claim 1 explicitly recites that logical routing allows “said first service to act on said message without said message being physically delivered to said first service over said public network,” and “said second service to act on said message without said message being physically delivered to said second service over said public network.” Similarly, claim 14 explicitly recites that logical routing allows “services to be invoked without the messages being physically delivered to one or more of the services among the plurality of services.” Finally, claim 28 explicitly recites that logical delivery allows “said first service to act on said message without said message being physically delivered to said first service.”

Because each of the independent claims includes an explicit definition of the term “logical routing” or the term “logical delivery,” and because the specification provides examples of specific implementations of the recited functionality, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand the meaning of this claim term as well as understand how to implement the claimed functionality. For this reason, the applicants believe the claims of the present application comply with the second paragraph of section 112, and that the rejection should therefore be withdrawn.

## Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 14-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002-0091533 (Ims). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

In indicating allowable subject matter in claims 1-13, the Examiner correctly pointed out that “[t]he references of record, in particular Ims, fails to singly or in combination teach a message routing network for exchanging application-level messages between services in which the context of the communications between the services is established by the services.” Presumably, the Examiner was referring to the limitation in claim 1 which recites that “said second service invocation having a second context that is defined at least in part by said first service.”

Claim 14 is a system claim with limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1 and recites that “a context of an invocation is defined at least in part by an invoking service.” Similarly, claim 28 is a method claim with limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1 and recites that “said first service invocation has a first context defined at least in part by a first invoking service.” Because claims 14 and 28 include limitations similar to the limitation in claim 1 which the Examiner identified as not being present in the art of record, the applicants assert that these claims are patentable for at least this reason, and that therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

And because claims 15-27 depend from claim 14, and claims 29-34 depend from claim 28, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 14 and 28.

The applicants respectfully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-13.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

/Joseph M. Villeneuve/  
Joseph M. Villeneuve  
Reg. No. 37,460

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100